

## **REMARKS**

### **A. Background**

The present Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed May 5, 2008. Claims 1-16 were pending, with claim 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, claims 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) or (e) or 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and claims 1-12 were allowed.<sup>1</sup> The Office Action also rejected the specification of the present application for not including an abstract on a separate sheet under 37 C.F.R. § 1.52(b)(4). Claim 13 has been amended.<sup>2</sup> Claims 14-16 have been cancelled. Claims 1-13 are now pending in view of the above amendments.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments to the claims and the following remarks. For the Examiner's convenience and reference, Applicant's remarks are presented in the order in which the corresponding issues were raised in the Office Action.

Please note that the following remarks are not intended to be an exhaustive enumeration of the distinctions between any cited references and the claimed invention. Rather, the distinctions identified and discussed below are presented solely by way of example to illustrate some of the differences between the claimed invention and the cited references. In addition, Applicants request that the Examiner carefully review any references discussed below to ensure that Applicants understanding and discussion of the references, if any, is consistent with the Examiner's understanding.

### **B. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**

The Office Action rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claim 13 has been amended to depend from claim 8, as recommended by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully requests removal of this rejection.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Examiner's allowance of claims 1-12 is appreciated.

<sup>2</sup> Support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the specification.

**C. Rejection of the Specification**

The Office Action rejected the specification of the present application for not including an abstract on a separate sheet under 37 C.F.R. § 1.52(b)(4). Applicant has amended the specification to provide the abstract on its own separate sheet. Applicant respectfully requests removal of this rejection.

**D. Prior Art Rejections**

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(A OR E) AND 35 U.S.C. § 103(A)**

The Office Action rejected claims 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) or (e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0188318 (*Carley*) and in the alternative under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Carley*.<sup>3</sup> Claims 14-16 have been cancelled. Therefore, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

**E. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe the claims as amended are in allowable form. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, or which may be overcome by an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 30th day of July 2008.

Respectfully submitted,

/Fraser D. Roy, Reg.# 45666/

FRASER D. ROY  
Registration No. 45,666  
Attorney for Applicant  
Customer No. 057360  
Telephone No. 801.533.9800

FDR:PNT  
1822508\_1.DOC

---

<sup>3</sup> Although the prior art status of the cited art in this and the remaining rejections is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should the need arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.